

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed June 14, 2004 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Rejection(s) Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 1 – 8, 15, 17, 18, 19, 23, 24, 26, 27, 30 – 32, 35, 36, and 38 – 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Tso in view of Oh and DiGiorgio.

The rejection correctly notes that “Tso and Oh fail to disclose notifications independently of the established communication link.” It is contended, however, that this feature is shown in DiGiorgio, and that DiGiorgio is properly combinable with Tso and Oh to render unpatentable the presently claimed invention. Applicants respectfully disagree.

In particular, DiGiorgio does not disclose the missing feature—namely, “logic in the housing adapted to periodically check for message notifications independently of the established communication link.” (Claim 1, lines 7 – 8, emphasis added). This feature is defined in the written description, for example on page 11, lines 3 – 5, wherein it is stated that “the wake-up function checks for communications and message notifications regardless of whether or not the modem 122 is connected to the handheld device 101.” (Emphasis added)

The DiGiorgio expansion unit is intended to provide expanded I/O port capabilities for devices having limited I/O capabilities, such as a PDA, which typically only has one I/O port, but which may need to communicate with multiple devices. The expansion unit is described exclusively in terms of the expanded capabilities it provides when it is connected to the host device. There is no discussion of what the expansion unit can or cannot do when it is not connected. Therefore DiGiorgio adds nothing to the combination of Tso and Oh, and does not

remedy their acknowledged failure to teach “logic in the housing adapted to periodically check for message notifications independently of the established communication link.” The other applied prior also fails to remedy this shortcoming. Accordingly, the invention of Claims 1, 26, and 36, all of which recite the missing feature, and from which all the remaining claims depend, is patentable over the applied prior art.

Conclusion


In view of the preceding discussion, Applicants respectfully urge that the claims of the present application define patentable subject matter and should be passed to allowance. Such allowance is respectfully solicited.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone call would help advance prosecution of the present invention, the Examiner is kindly invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number below.

Please charge any additional required fee, including those necessary to obtain extensions of time to render timely the filing of the instant Reply, or credit any overpayment not otherwise paid or credited, to our deposit account No. 50-1698.

Respectfully submitted,
THELEN REID & PRIEST, L.L.P.

Dated: July 28, 2004


Khaled Shami
Reg. No. 38,745

Thelen Reid & Priest LLP
P.O. Box 640640
San Jose, CA 95164-0640
Tel. (408) 282-1855
Fax. (408) 287-8040